

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

D STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/020,956 | 12/19/2001 | Kiyoo Morita | Q67795 | 1153 |
| 7590 01/05/2004 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | KIM, SANG K | |
| 2100 Pennsylva Washington, D | nia Avenue, N.W. C 20037 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3654 | |
| | | DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|---|---|
| Advisory Action | 10/020,956 | MORITA, KIYOO |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| • | SANG KIM | 3654 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply to a |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH | g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | |
| (a) \square they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); |
| (b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. |
| NOTE: | | |
| $3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): <u>112 1st rejection on new r</u> | natter. |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | parate, timely filed amendment |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: none. | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: none. | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a | a) approved or b) disappi | roved by the Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | |
| 10. | , , , , – | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/020,956

Art Unit: 3654

Applicant's arguments, see page 4, filed 12/11/03, with respect to 112, 1st paragraph, rejection on new matter have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection on 112, 1st paragraph, on new matter has been withdrawn.

Furthermore, applicant's arguments filed 12/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to 112, 1st paragraph, rejection on the enablement requirement.

Applicant has failed to provide clarification on the interaction of the hub 11a with respect to the upper flange 12. Applicant refers to pages 7 and 8 of the subject application to clarify that the upper flange 12 is bonded to the hub 11 by welding through ultrasonic waves. However, in pages 7 and 8 of the subject application explains that the upper flange 12 is bonded to the hub 11, only by the means of the weldable bosses 11e, and nowhere in the specification points out that the upper flange 12 is bonded to the outer peripheral wall 11a. Thus, applicant has failed to clarify the connection between the upper flange 12 and the outer peripheral wall 11a.

Applicant has not provided clarification of the margins for error which were shown in the data present at the interview, 11/21/03. Furthermore, the lack of units (e.g. mm, µm) in the attached graphs makes it unclear whether the surface roughness of 10µm cited by applicant is significant or not (see page 5). For example, how does the surface roughness of 10µm measures into the data? Does it affect the margins for error? Applicant has failed to explain how the surface roughness plays into the data and the impact it might have on the outcome of the data.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/020,956

Art Unit: 3654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-3712. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone numbers are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

SK

12/31/03

KATHY MATECKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600